## REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

### Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 11.

### Acknowledgement of Priority

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge the claim for priority of the present application to European Patent No. 98401075.1 filed on April 29, 1998.

### Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge the drawings filed in the present application on October 25, 2000 as formal.

### Objections

Claims 2-4 and 12-15 are objected to due to inconsistencies of the limitations "data buffer sub-area," "sub-areas," and "other sub-areas." Claims 2-4, 12, and 14 have been amended by this reply to clarify any inconsistencies in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinitely for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner specifically states that it is unclear how a memory/buffer is able to perform a function of mixing/combining data. Applicant respectfully asserts that the claim does not recite that the memory/buffer is *active* in the combination of data.

Rather, the claim recites that data is combined therein (*i.e.,* the data is combined within the memory/buffer). As an analogy, consider a method for mixing water with wine in a glass, where the glass itself is not active in the mixing process, but the liquids are still mixed within the glass. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7 and 11-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by EP0752695 ("O'Sullivan"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed toward a method of processing video data in a receiver/decoder. Specifically, the receiver/decoder includes memory means including a data buffer area for storing incoming data for display (*i.e.,* video text data such as subtitles), and a graphics buffer area for storing graphics data (*i.e.,* icon data). Graphics data stored in the graphics buffer area is passed to the data buffer area for combination with display data that is stored there. For example, when a subtitle screen is received in the data buffer area, a central processing unit in the receiver/decoder passes icon data into the data buffer area. The icon data is passed into the data buffer area just before the data stored in the data buffer area is combined with other data to provide video data. Thus, an advantage of the present invention is that, in the event of an overlap between the icon data and part of the subtitle data, the icon data can be laid over the part of the subtitle that is overlapped, and the non-overlapped portions of the subtitle screen can be concurrently displayed with the icon data (see, *e.g.,* page 3, lines 1-7 of the present specification).

In contrast to the claimed invention, O'Sullivan discloses a method for simultaneously displaying graphics and video data on a display. Specifically, O'Sullivan discloses a graphics adapter chip that stores graphics data in a graphics memory, while a video source stores video data in a video memory. Further, in O'Sullivan, source selection logic is used to select when each of the graphics memory and the video memory output blocks of data to a digital-to-analog converter (DAC) for display on the screen (see, *e.g.,* Figure 1 of O'Sullivan).

With respect to the rejection of the claims, O'Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest the combination of incoming data and graphics data *in a data buffer area*, as recited in independent claim 1 of the present invention. Rather, O'Sullivan discloses combining data in the DAC,

where the combination of the data occurs "on the fly," immediately before the data is to be displayed on a display screen, which is clearly not the same as combining data in the data buffer area *in advance* of the data being displayed. In other words, because the data is combined and stored in a data buffer area in the present invention, the data is not immediately displayed, but can be displayed at some later time, whereas data combined in a DAC is displayed on the screen as soon as the DAC produces the output of the combined data.

In view of the above, O'Sullivan fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over O'Sullivan. Dependent claims 2-7 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Further, independent claim 11 contains similar allowable subject matter, and is patentable over O'Sullivan for the same reasons as independent claim 1. Associated dependent claims 12-19 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over O'Sullivan in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,156 ("Blonstein"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, O'Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of independent claim 1 of the present invention, and Blonstein fails to disclose or suggest that which O'Sullivan lacks. Specifically, Blonstein relates to a satellite television receiver using a remote pointing device to provide random user access to a graphical user interface (GUI) displayed on a TV screen. Cursor movement is displayed by multiple erasures and redraws of the cursor. However, Blonstein fails to disclose or suggest that incoming data is combined with graphics data in a data buffer area, where the data is combined and stored in the data buffer area for display at some later time. In fact, Blonstein only handles a cursor (which, according to the description of the present invention, is handled by another layer than that responsible for the graphics, see, *e.g.*, Figure 6 and the accompanying text). As claims 8-10 depend from independent claim 1, claims 8-10 are patentable for the reasons described above.

Thus, O'Sullivan and Blonstein, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to render claims 8-10 as obvious. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/027001).

Dated: December 22, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
Osha & May L.L.P.
1221 McKinney, Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)

84026_1.DOC

Application No. (if known): 09/674,079 Attorney Docket No.: 11345/027001

# Certificate of Express Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV576720173US in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on December 22, 2004
Date

Signature

Yuki Tsukuda
Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Registration Number, if applicable

(713) 228-8600
Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.